

# Coherence in Neutrino Interactions

C. Giunti

INFN, Sezione di Torino, and Dipartimento di Fisica Teorica,  
 Università di Torino, Via P. Giuria 1, I-10125 Torino, Italy

## Abstract

The claim in hep-ph/0301231 is refuted in a pedagogical way. It is explicitly shown that extremely relativistic neutrinos produced in pion decay are correctly described by the standard flavor neutrino states which are a coherent superposition of massive neutrino states.

The author of Ref. [5] wrote:

If neutrinos are massive, ‘lepton flavor eigenstates’ are absent from the amplitudes of all Standard Model processes.

His argument follows from a faulty calculation of the amplitude in the pion decay process

$$\pi^- \rightarrow \ell^- + \bar{\nu}_\ell, \quad (1)$$

where  $\ell = e, \mu$ .

According to the standard theory of neutrino mixing [4, 6, 1, 2], the antineutrino produced in the process (1) is described by the *coherent superposition of massive antineutrino states*

$$|\bar{\nu}_\ell\rangle = \sum_k U_{\ell k} |\bar{\nu}_k\rangle, \quad (2)$$

where  $U$  is the unitary mixing matrix. Sometimes such a state is called “flavor state”, or “flavor eigenstate”, or “lepton flavor eigenstate”. The author of Ref. [5] claimed that

the introduction of such ‘lepton flavor eigenstates’ as linear superpositions of neutrino mass eigenstates leads to predictions that are excluded by experiment.

In order to confute the argument presented in Ref. [5], let us calculate in a correct way the amplitude of the pion decay process (1) in the case of neutrino mixing.

At the first order of perturbation theory, the amplitude of the pion decay process (1) is

$$\mathcal{A}_{\pi^- \rightarrow \ell^- \bar{\nu}_\ell} = \langle \ell^-, \bar{\nu}_\ell | -i \int d^4x \mathcal{H}_I^{\text{CC}}(x) | \pi^- \rangle, \quad (3)$$

with the Charged-Current Standard Model weak interaction Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_I^{\text{CC}}(x) &= \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{\ell=e,\mu,\tau} \bar{\ell}(x) \gamma^\rho (1 - \gamma_5) \nu_\ell(x) J_\rho(x) + \text{h.c.} \\ &= \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{\ell=e,\mu,\tau} \sum_k \bar{\ell}(x) \gamma^\rho (1 - \gamma_5) U_{\ell k} \nu_k(x) J_\rho(x) + \text{h.c.},\end{aligned}\quad (4)$$

where  $G_F$  is the Fermi constant and  $J_\rho(x)$  is the hadronic weak charged current. Notice that we have expressed the Hamiltonian in terms of the neutrino fields  $\nu_k(x)$  with mass  $m_k$ , that create the corresponding massive antineutrino states  $|\bar{\nu}_k\rangle$  in Eq. (2).

Using Eqs. (2) and (4), the amplitude (3) can be written as

$$\mathcal{A}_{\pi^- \rightarrow \ell^- \bar{\nu}_\ell} = -i \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \int d^4x \sum_{k,j} U_{\ell k}^* U_{\ell j} \langle \ell^-, \bar{\nu}_k | \bar{\ell}(x) \gamma^\rho (1 - \gamma_5) \nu_j(x) J_\rho(x) | \pi^- \rangle. \quad (5)$$

Notice the presence in Eq. (5) of two elements of the mixing matrix, one coming from the mixing of the states in Eq. (2) and the other coming from the mixing of the fields in Eq. (4). Since only the state  $|\bar{\nu}_k\rangle$  is a quantum of the corresponding massive neutrino field  $\nu_k(x)$ , the matrix element in Eq. (5) is proportional to  $\delta_{kj}$ ,

$$\langle \ell^-, \bar{\nu}_k | \bar{\ell}(x) \gamma^\rho (1 - \gamma_5) \nu_j(x) J_\rho(x) | \pi^- \rangle \propto \delta_{kj}, \quad (6)$$

leading to

$$\mathcal{A}_{\pi^- \rightarrow \ell^- \bar{\nu}_\ell} = -i \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \int d^4x \sum_k |U_{\ell k}|^2 \langle \ell^-, \bar{\nu}_k | \bar{\ell}(x) \gamma^\rho (1 - \gamma_5) \nu_k(x) J_\rho(x) | \pi^- \rangle. \quad (7)$$

Since the neutrino masses are much smaller than the energy released in the pion decay process (1), the dependence of the matrix elements in Eq. (7) on the corresponding neutrino mass  $m_k$  can be neglected and the matrix elements can be approximated with the matrix element in the case of massless neutrinos,

$$\langle \ell^-, \bar{\nu}_k | \bar{\ell}(x) \gamma^\rho (1 - \gamma_5) \nu_k(x) J_\rho(x) | \pi^- \rangle \simeq \langle \ell^-, \bar{\nu} | \bar{\ell}(x) \gamma^\rho (1 - \gamma_5) \nu(x) J_\rho(x) | \pi^- \rangle, \quad (8)$$

where  $\nu(x)$  is a massless neutrino field with antineutrino quanta  $|\bar{\nu}\rangle$ . In this case, the matrix elements in Eq. (7) can be extracted from the sum over the mass index  $k$  and, using the unitarity relation  $\sum_k |U_{\ell k}|^2 = 1$ , one obtains

$$\mathcal{A}_{\pi^- \rightarrow \ell^- \bar{\nu}_\ell} \simeq -i \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \int d^4x \langle \ell^-, \bar{\nu} | \bar{\ell}(x) \gamma^\rho (1 - \gamma_5) \nu(x) J_\rho(x) | \pi^- \rangle, \quad (9)$$

which is the amplitude of the pion decay process (1) in the case of massless neutrinos.

Therefore, in the realistic case of extremely relativistic neutrinos the pion decay rate calculated in a correct way using the flavor antineutrino state (2) practically coincides with the standard pion decay rate calculated assuming massless neutrinos. It is pretty obvious that a similar conclusion holds for all weak processes.

Somehow the author of Ref. [5] missed the quadratic dependence of the amplitude on the elements of the mixing matrix and obtained an absurd result: if  $|U_{\ell k}|^2$  in Eq. (7)

were replaced by  $U_{\ell k}$ , as sadly happens in Ref. [5], the amplitude would depend on the elements of the mixing matrix even in the case of massless neutrinos. This is clearly nonsense, because in the case of massless neutrinos there is no mixing. Nevertheless, the author of Ref. [5] considered it seriously and confronted the resulting decay rate with experimental data. Since the measured ratio of the  $\pi^- \rightarrow e^- + \bar{\nu}_e$  and  $\pi^- \rightarrow \mu^- + \bar{\nu}_\mu$  decay rates is incompatible with the wrong ratio calculated in Ref. [5], the author of Ref. [5] erroneously claimed that the neutrino produced in the process (1) is not described by the coherent superposition of massive antineutrino states in Eq. (2).

Having clarified the main mistake in Ref. [5], some further remarks are in order:

1. The author of Ref. [5] denies the coherent character of massive neutrino states produced in weak processes, but somewhat manages to get neutrino oscillations (albeit with a wrong phase, see item 3 below). Obviously there is a contradiction: since neutrino oscillations are due to the interference of different massive neutrinos their coherence is required.
2. Ref. [9] was cited in an improper way in Ref. [5], in connection with the sentence “the unphysical nature of coherent states of neutrinos of different mass was also discussed in the literature”. On the contrary, in Ref. [9] it is explicitly written that neutrinos produced in weak interaction processes are described by a (coherent) superposition of massive neutrino states, which in the realistic limit of extremely relativistic neutrinos reduces to the standard expression (2). These flavor neutrino states (called “weak-process states” in Ref. [9]) were recently calculated in Ref. [7] in a quantum field theoretical wave packet approach.

In Ref. [9] it has been shown that the flavor state  $|\bar{\nu}_\ell\rangle$  in Eq. (2) is not a quantum of the field  $\nu_\ell(x)$ , and the field  $\nu_\ell(x)$  is not quantizable<sup>1</sup> because it does not have a definite mass (different flavor neutrino fields are coupled through the non-diagonal mass term in the Lagrangian). Obviously, this does not mean that a flavor state  $|\bar{\nu}_\ell\rangle$  defined as a coherent superposition of massive antineutrino states is “unphysical”, as claimed in Ref. [5].

3. The final goal of Ref.[5] is to renew the claim of a factor of two mistake in the standard phase of neutrino oscillations. This claim has been already confuted in Refs. [10, 8, 11].

In conclusion, we would like to express a note of praise for the electronic archives, which allow a wide diffusion of all kind of ideas that stimulate interesting thinking.

## References

- [1] S. M. Bilenky and B. Pontecorvo, “Again on neutrino oscillations”, *Nuovo Cim. Lett.*, 17, 569, 1976.

---

<sup>1</sup>In Ref. [9] it has been implicitly assumed that a flavor neutrino state is a superposition of massive neutrino states, excluding any antineutrino component. If this assumption is relaxed, the flavor fields  $\nu_\ell(x)$  can be quantized, as shown in Ref. [3]. However, the physical meaning of a superposition of massive neutrino and antineutrino states is unclear to us.

- [2] S. M. Bilenky and B. Pontecorvo, “Lepton mixing and neutrino oscillations”, *Phys. Rept.*, 41, 225, 1978.
- [3] M. Blasone and G. Vitiello, “Quantum field theory of fermion mixing”, *Ann. Phys.*, 244, 283–311, 1995, [hep-ph/9501263](#).
- [4] S. Eliezer and A. R. Swift, “Experimental consequences of electron neutrino - muon neutrino mixing in neutrino beams”, *Nucl. Phys.*, B105, 45, 1976.
- [5] J. H. Field, “Lepton flavour eigenstates do not exist if neutrinos are massive: ‘Neutrino oscillations’ reconsidered”, 2003, [hep-ph/0301231](#).
- [6] H. Fritzsch and P. Minkowski, “Vector - like weak currents, massive neutrinos, and neutrino beam oscillations”, *Phys. Lett.*, B62, 72, 1976.
- [7] C. Giunti, “Neutrino wave packets in quantum field theory”, *JHEP*, 11, 017, 2002, [hep-ph/0205014](#).
- [8] C. Giunti, “The phase of neutrino oscillations”, *Physica Scripta*, 67, 29–33, 2003, [hep-ph/0202063](#).
- [9] C. Giunti, C. W. Kim, and U. W. Lee, “Remarks on the weak states of neutrinos”, *Phys. Rev.*, D45, 2414–2420, 1992.
- [10] C. Giunti and C. W. Kim, “Quantum mechanics of neutrino oscillations”, *Found. Phys. Lett.*, 14, 213–229, 2001, [hep-ph/0011074](#).
- [11] L. Okun, M. Schepkin, and I. Tsukerman, “On the extra factor of two in the phase of neutrino oscillations”, 2002, [hep-ph/0211241](#).